DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 307 813 FL 018 023

AUTHOR Gebhard, Jerry G.; Oprandy, Robert
TITLE Multiple Activities in Teacher Preparation: Opportunities for Change.
PUB DATE 89
NOTE 26p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Behavior Change; *Classroom Research; Higher Education; Journal Writing; Language Teachers; Learning Activities; Models; *Preservice Teacher Education; Research Opportunities; Second Language Instruction; *Student Teachers; Student Teaching; Teacher Improvement; *Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

A model for foreign language teacher education is suggested. The model is based on the premise that multiple activities in a teaching curriculum provide opportunities for foreign language student teachers to explore and change their teaching behaviors. The following six activities are discussed: (1) practice teaching, (2) observing teaching, (3) doing investigative projects, (4) talking about teaching, (5) reading about teaching, and (6) keeping a journal. Practice teaching gives student teachers the opportunity to experiment with different strategies in various situations. Observing teaching opens up the possibility for new insight into what they can do as classroom teachers, including classroom-based research. Doing investigative projects allows student teachers to study more intensively different aspects of their teaching. Talking about teaching lets student teachers share and compare their observations, investigations, and experiences with other teachers. Reading about teaching offers student teachers the opportunity to consider how various teaching behaviors can be implemented into their classroom. Keeping a journal affords student teachers a vehicle for reacting to lessons and for sharing feelings about what they are doing in the practicum. Guidelines are suggested for each of the different activities. (DJD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Gebhard, J.
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

Multiple Activities in Teacher Preparation: Opportunities for Change

Jerry G. Gebhard
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Robert Oprandy
Teachers College, Columbia University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED307813

The purpose of this article is to share insights into how multiple activities in a teaching practicum can set up opportunities for student-teachers to explore and change their teaching behaviors. Six activities are discussed, including: (1) practice-teaching, (2) observing teaching, (3) doing investigative projects, (4) talking about teaching, (5) reading about teaching, and (6) keeping a journal. The premise of this article is that student-teachers are provided with opportunities to change when they can process teaching through multiple activities, especially if they are given chances to relate one experience to another and they feel secure in the teacher preparation setting.

How have public health officials worked successfully at getting people in the United States to reduce or stop smoking? As a consequence of the Surgeon General's report on smoking and lung cancer? Due to magazine and newspaper articles about the hazards of smoking and the benefits of quitting? Due to changes in advertising and warning labels on cigarette packages? Politicalization of the nonsmokers? Actually, the reduction in the number of smokers is most likely due to a combination of these and other interventions. As Lawrence Wallack, a researcher at the University of California School of Public Health, puts it, "each intervention may be a small and insignificant event in its own right, and we probably overestimate the importance of any event

FL018023

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

while underestimating the importance of all of them taken together" (Meredith, 1984:48).

As public health officials have used many different interventions to help people change their smoking habits, it is our belief that student-teachers can change their teaching behaviors as a consequence of experiencing multiple interventions (in the form of activities). In this paper we discuss six kinds of activities that we believe provide the opportunities for student-teachers to explore and change their teaching behaviors. Since we believe that change is facilitated when student-teachers are given chances to relate one experience to another and feel secure in the teacher preparation setting, we not only discuss specific activities, but also include how one activity can be related to another and how a secure learning setting can be established.

We want to point out that this model of teacher preparation is not based solely on common sense, but on our systematic observation of teachers and on on-going analysis of the relationship between teacher change and the kinds of multiple activities (and behaviors within them) which we have used and observed others use in the process of educating teachers. (See Gebhard, 1985, for one such descriptive study). Thus, we are in agreement with Fanselow (1983), Fanselow and Light (1977) and Stern (1983) in the field of second language teaching and Gage (1979) and Haberman (1986) in education in general, that teacher preparation should be based on efforts to understand what works, not on preconceived ideas or common sense notions of how teacher preparation should be done.

The six activities discussed include:

(1) practice-teaching

(2) observing teaching

(3) doing projects on the investigation of teaching

(4) talking about teaching

(5) reading about teaching

(6) keeping a journal

(1) Practice-Teaching

By practice-teaching we mean a context in which student-teachers interact with real second/foreign language students. Sometimes teacher educators provide such a context through their institution or an affiliated one, or student-teachers are required to teach in a public institution.

One benefit of a real teaching context is that it provides chances for student-teachers to use the knowledge gained in course work outside the practicum and from experiences in the practicum outside of their classroom teaching; such as observations of other teachers, readings about teaching, discussions in the seminar, or chats over lunch. In the process of teaching they can utilize their accumulated knowledge, developing more and more sophisticated ways to work with students.

Likewise, student-teachers can take their classroom teaching experience into other courses or other contexts in the practicum, making their classroom experience a tool to think through theoretical and other issues. As Alatis, Stern, and Strevens point out, "practice provides essential experience that, ultimately, gives meaning to theory" (1983:2). Thus, a cycle is set up through which student-teachers can continually become aware of and change their teaching.

A less discussed, but no less powerful, benefit of practice-teaching is that the interaction involved in the activity of teaching itself provides opportunity for student-teachers to change their teaching behaviors. Through the use of two representative scenes of interaction between a student-teacher (June) and an ESL student (Anna) in a classroom setting it is possible to

demonstrate this point. The first scene took place two weeks into a practicum for inexperienced teachers.

Scene 1.0

1.1 Anna: I have only two sister.

1.2 June: Uh huh.

1.3 Anna: I have no brother.

1.4 June: Two sisters (June says this with rising intonation).

1.5 Anna: Because my mother she dead when I was three years old.

1.6 June: She died when you were three?

1.7 Anna: Yes. She dead when I was three years old.

In Scene 1.0 June experienced interaction which afforded her the opportunity to try out two ways of treating the student's errors. She used rising intonation (1.4) and emphatic stress (1.6). The student was likewise given the chance to experience the way June treated her errors. The next scene took place after seven additional hours of classroom interaction over a two week period:

Scene 2.0

2.1 Anna: When the house built?

2.2 June: When was.

2.3 Anna: When was?

2.4 June: When was. When was.

2.5 Fred: When was.

2.6 Anna: When was the house built?

Anna and June had apparently come to a mutual understanding about June's use of emphatic stress, and June was afforded another chance to make changes in the way she presented the emphatically made correction. For example, in her earlier attempt she did not treat Anna's error immediately, but waited until

after Anna had said "I have no brother" (1.4). In her later attempt she treated Anna's error immediately after the sentence with the error (2.2). In her earlier attempt to treat Anna's error, "Because my mother dead when I was three years old" (1.5), June put the stressed correction into a complete sentence, "She died when you were three?" (1.6), which apparently also meant to continue the conversation. In her later attempt at treating the error she stopped the conversation at the point of error, "When was" (2.2), thus highlighting the location of the error. It is interesting that June simplified her language, an adjustment as Gaies (1977) points out, that can be directly related to the proficiency level of the student.

This example of the changes June went through in treating Anna's errors only serves to point out what others (Allwright, 1980; Garfinkel, 1967; McDermott and Roth, 1978; Mehan, 1974) have already said about interaction, that change in behavior is the result of continual negotiation between people. We are suggesting that this experience of negotiation between student-teachers and ESL students is very valuable because it sets up the opportunity for teachers to change their teaching behaviors.

(2) Observing Teaching

Observations of teaching provide opportunities for student-teachers to view and study a variety of different teaching settings and behaviors, and this experience opens up the possibility for new awarenesses about what they can do as classroom teachers and changes they can make in their behavior. For example, a student-teacher, whose class was dominated by a large number of Spanish speaking students and who was having trouble getting them to use English during small group activities, observed another student-teacher handle the same problem. That student-teacher stopped the activity and said, "Okay. I want everyone to speak only Spanish for a few minutes. No English!" The students, who appeared

to be a little confused, laughed. The student-teacher added, "Why are you here? Are you here to speak Spanish?" When the students resumed the activity, they did their best in English. The student-teacher who observed the class later attempted the same intervetion in her class. Unfortunately, it did not work! However, she reported that the observation stimulated thoughts about alternatives to get students to use English, and she was able to arrange the seating so that each small group included at least one or two non-Spanish speaking students.

Observation of teaching can take place in a number of different settings and through different mediums. One way is for student-teachers to visit each others' classrooms. Another way is for them to have their classes videotaped, and parts of the taped lessons can be observed by the student-teachers together in the practicum seminar as a whole class or in small groups in or outside the seminar. The tape could also be viewed alone with the teacher educator or by the student-teacher alone. The use of tape recorders adds another possibility. Small recorders seem to work well because they are unobstrusive, or at least become so with use. They allow the student-teacher the freedom to move the recorder around, setting it on a desk, walking around with it, or putting it in the middle of a small group during an activity.

We have found an especially equipped observation room useful in providing student-teachers with chances to gain new awarenesses of teaching-learning dynamics. While one student-teacher is teaching a class in one room, other student-teachers join the teacher-educator in an observation room behind a one-way mirror. This setting not only provides chances for student-teachers to observe teaching, but also to talk about it, and many productive discussions can come out of this experience. For example, in the observation referred to earlier in which the classroom teacher was able to get the students to stop

using Spanish by telling them to speak only in Spanish, the student-teachers who were observing from the booth behind the mirror had the opportunity to generate other ways to get students to use English, such as writing on the board, "Only use English" and pointing to it when students broke into Spanish and arranging with the students in a community spirit for them to contribute five cents toward a party everytime they spoke in Spanish.

Having a variety of possible contexts from which observation can take place allows for consideration that student-teachers do not all react in the same way to the same context. For example, while one person might become highly engaged in observation by visiting a classroom, another may not, preferring instead to view video tapes several times, stopping the action to raise questions about a particular teaching behavior.

Multiple observation settings allow the teacher-educator to consider the security of the student-teachers. For example, some student-teachers are initially threatened by the thought of having their teaching observed by their peers, and in such cases, they would have the freedom to view their tapes alone or with close friends. We have found that after they gained experience in viewing their own teaching in a personally "secure" setting and having participated in discussions centered around others teaching, the less "secure" student-teachers open up to the possibility of having their teaching observed and the center for discussion, especially if the discussion is based on description rather than judgments of teaching behaviors.

Observations of teaching can be done more systematically if student-teachers are taught to use an observation instrument, and there are many instruments to draw from, each with its own system for recording an observation (rating scale, sign system, category system), emphasis on what kinds of behaviors to focus on, and degree of complexity. It is out of the scope of this

paper to describe the multi-facets of observation systems; Libdeh (1984), Long (1980), Rosenshine and Furst (1973), and Simon and Boyer (1974) offer more elaborate discussion than we can here. However, it is worth pointing out the benefits and drawbacks of those instruments or systems which have been used to observe second/foreign language classrooms, and in so doing, point out some of the instruments which student-teachers can be taught to use to observe interaction.

A rating scale has traditionally been equated with teacher evaluation. A list of traits deemed important ("Teacher gives clear directions", "Students spend time on task", "Teacher has high expectations") are provided and the observer selects an appropriate category ("excellent", "adequate", "inadequate", "frequently", "seldom" ...) to make a judgment about the teacher's performance. Although the system is easy to use, it has many drawbacks. One problem is that it is highly judgmental, and many teachers are threatened by it. If the point of observation is to make the teacher more aware of his or her teaching, these judgments can interfere with this process. As Simon and Boyer (1974) point out, both positive and negative judgments can obscure the message. Positive judgments can make the recipient feel good as a person, negative judgments bad, and both types of feelings tend to focus attention away from the idea being conveyed and toward the judgment being made.

A second problem with a rating scale is in the selection of traits. As many educators/researchers (Cyphert, 1977; Dunkin and Biddle, 1974; Fanselow, in press; Long, 1983, among others) have pointed out, we do not know enough about the relationship between teaching and learning to prescribe what teaching behaviors are the most productive. A third problem, as Long points out, is that this instrument is "most at risk from the falibility of observers' memory and the amount of interpretation embodied in the data it produces" (1983:7).

However, there are possible creative uses of rating in teacher preparation. Rees (1980), for example, has developed one to be used by teachers for self-analysis. The classroom teacher is asked to rate interaction around a number of classroom activities from "unfavorable" to "favorable". The teacher-educator does the same, based on the observation of the class. The teacher can then compare his/her impressions with that of the teacher-educator.

Another type of observation instrument is a "sign system" in which the observer is given a list of events to watch for in the classroom, such as "Teacher asks question", "Student responds", "Silence", and the observer is asked to check off those events that occur during a given time period, for example, every three seconds. Noted advantages of using a sign system are that they are easy to use, allow little room for observer bias, and capture most of what is going on within the designated categories (although L. Bailey, 1975, questions how well this can be done).

In second/foreign language teacher preparation, Flander's (1960) sign system, Interaction Analysis, has been adapted by Moskowitz (1971), Nearhoof (1969) and Wragg (1970). However, it is now generally recognized that this system has serious limitations, the most outstanding being that the philosophical base on which it is built carries with it the belief that nondirective teaching is the most effective way to teach. In addition, it was designed to look at interaction in content area classrooms, and although it has been adapted for ESL/EFL classrooms by those who use it, the system misses much of the type of interaction which goes on in these classes. For example, it does not account for student-student interaction since it is teacher centered, and it does not provide a way to recognize feedback to learners on their use of language.

A third instrument through which student-teachers can observe classroom interaction is a category system which, as its name implies, contains lists of behavioral categories into which observed events ae classified. One category system is Fanselow's (1977, in press) FOCUS (Foci for Observing Communication Used in Settings). We have found this system very useful in teacher preparation because the five major categories and their subcategories are easy to learn and afford student-teachers opportunities to become aware of many aspects of their teaching. These aspects include who/what the sources and targets of communication are (teacher, student, group, class, book, blackboard notes, etc.), what pedagogical moves are made (structuring, soliciting, responding, reacting), what mediums are used to communicate content (linguistic, non-linguistic, paralinguistic, silence), how mediums are used to communicate content (attend to, present, characterize, relate, reproduce, set content), and what areas of content are communicated (study, life, procedure). The system seems to keep the student-teachers' interest because they can study their teaching through any one category or across categories. It also allows teachers to consider the consequences of what and how they teach on students' interaction as well as provides a meta-language through which teaching can be discussed and alternative teaching behaviors generated.

Other category systems were designed for or are a product of classroom centered research (CCR). As Long points out, "a by-product of CCR has been the development by researchers of a range of analytic devices, principally ways of classifying teachers' and students' classroom verbal behavior" (1983:288), and these devices, when used by student-teachers as categories for observation, can be a means through which student-teachers can gain new insights into teaching behavior. Long (1983) makes this very point when he suggests, based on a study by Long and Sato (1983), the usefulness of observing interaction for evidence of

"display" questions (questions in which the answer is known by the asker) and "referential" questions (questions in which the asker is asking for reference to unknown information) or whether classroom interaction includes evidence of "confirmation checks", "clarification checks", and "comprehension checks". However, one needs to keep in mind that categories which come out of current research carry with them certain beliefs about what is important to focus on in second/foreign langauge teaching, in this case that genuine communication (such as asking "referential" questions rather than many "display" questions) is an important part of classroom teaching.

In order to ease student-teachers entry into the world of classroom observation, and to limit the scope of an observation, "observation tasks" can be used which are based on knowledge of observation systems. Below are some of the tasks we ask student-teachers to do while observing classroom interaction:

* Visit a friend's class. Select one student. Sit beside that person. Make two columns on a piece of paper, and on one side write down everything that the teacher asks that student to do. On the other side write down what the student does.

* Go from classroom to classroom. Draw seating arrangements you see.

* Draw a map of a classroom you are observing. Draw in where the students and teacher are located. For fifteen minutes keep a record of who the source of communication is. You can select a group to observe if group work is being done.

* Tape record your own or a friend's class. Make a transcription of a few minutes of interaction. Make sure the segment of interaction you select has questions and responses. Take your watch or a stop watch if you have one) and note down how many seconds there are between the time the person asks a question and either the response he/she gets or the asking of the same question again (or other communications). Then, study the interaction for patterns of solicits, responses, and reacts. Is the pattern different when the person waits two or more seconds after soliciting?

(3) Doing Projects on the Investigation of Teaching

Teacher educators can have student-teachers do investigations of their teaching. As we see them, these projects follow some of the same principles of

CCR, as discussed by Bailey (1985), Gaies (1983), and Long (1980). Like CCR, the priority is on direct observation of classroom activity and the aim is to describe classroom interaction, not look for a better way to teach. However, a major difference is that investigations do not have to be research as such, which describes "as fully as possible the complexity of second language instruction" (Gaies, 1983:206) nor to contribute to a body of professional research. Rather, the aim is simply to provide student-teachers with the chance to select some aspect of their teaching to study in more detail than they normally would, and subsequently to gain new awareness of the interaction which goes on in their classrooms.

The selection of a topic for investigation can be provided or left up to the student-teachers. We encourage student-teachers to use their own criteria for the selection of their investigative projects, believing that if the student-teachers take on this responsibility, the experience will be more meaningful for them. And, student-teachers seem to base their choices of topics on a combination of factors, rather than on a single reason. For example, one student-teacher decided to investigate the effects of silence in classrooms after reading an article on "wait time" by Rowe (1969), discussing the pedagogical uses of silence in the seminar, and doing an observation task (presented above). Other investigative topics student-teachers have done include:

* How do I treat student errors when the content is grammar? The sound system? How are my beliefs about language and errors reflected in the way I treat errors?

* What aspects of the interaction in my classroom is truly communicative? How does my input contribute to the sharing of feelings and (unknown) knowledge between the participants? What kinds of group activities are truly communicative?

* How do I respond to students' questions? Do I present the answer directly (as I think I do)? What would happen if I did not present an answer, but gave students a task to do? For example, if a

student asked me how to spell "antique", what would happen if I responded with, "Select the one you think is correct: 'antik', 'antique', or 'antiik'"? What are other possible ways to respond to their questions, and what are the consequences?

* What makes some directions I give clearer than others? Can I determine the features of clear directions and set up guidelines for making my directions clearer?

It is also possible to provide guidelines for student-teachers to follow when doing their investigations. We offer the following, but also encourage student-teachers' creative efforts in designing their own procedures:

(1) Select an area of your teaching you are interested in learning more about; (2) Video or audio tape classroom interaction which centers around that aspect of your teaching; (3) Transcribe the parts of the tape(s) you are investigating; (4) Code the interaction using an observation system you like or through the use of categories you have designed for the study. Study your coding for patterns; (5) Decide on a change in teaching behavior which will break the pattern; (6) Implement the change while taping the classroom interaction, and again transcribe, code, study, and ... (7) Finally compare the consequences in the use of the old pattern with the new one.

If student-teachers are interested in a more "unstructured" (not to be equated with "unsystematic") approach to their investigations, it is possible to provide guidance through the insights of ethnographers. For example, it is possible to make them aware, as Long (1980) does for researchers, that:

> The anthropological approach to classroom research is procedurally highly systematic. What is observed and, hence, the data gathered using these procedures, however, is free to vary during the course of the observation as a reflection of the observer's developing understanding of what he or she is studying. The difference, then, is that the structuring is done by the researcher...and not by the data-gathering device prior to beginning the observation (p.).

It is thus possible to provide less prescriptive guidelines than those presented earlier. Simply telling a student-teacher to focus on basic questions, such as

"What are the participants doing?" "How are they doing it?", and "What patterns of interaction can you find?" offers an entry into the world of interactional analysis.

Whether student-teachers do highly structured or less structured investigations of teaching is not important as long as they go about the task in a systematic way. And, there are benefits, a major one being "a heightened awareness that even a simple analysis brings of the complexity of classroom processes on the one hand, and on the other, of the relative superficiality of much prescriptive writing on the 'what' and 'how' of language teaching" (Long, 1983:292).

(4) Talking about Teaching

Talk about teaching can take place in a number of structured settings, such as in the seminar, during supervisory conferences, or in the observation room, or in less structured contexts, such as among student-teachers over lunch, in the student lounge or simply in the hallway. Such settings are important because they provide opportunities for student-teachers to discuss not only their teaching, but also their observations, investigations, and other experiences. Through this sharing process they have the chance to relate their experience to others', gain new awareness of possible teaching behaviors, and consider their role as teachers.

For seminar purposes, student-teachers can be asked to bring in their findings from observation tasks as well as video/audio recordings of their teaching. For example, one student-teacher brought in her findings from an observation task described earlier in which student-teachers were asked to sit beside an ESL student and write down everything the student was asked to do and what the student actually did. The following is part of what that student-teacher wrote down:

Teacher's Structure and Solicits	Student's Response
*Teacher gives ou paragraph and asks student to read it and to answer questions at end.	*Student reads and begins to to answer questions, but does not finish.
*Teacher asks student for answer to question number four.	*Student searches the reading quickly for the answer but can not find it.
*Teacher asks student same question.	*Student sinks into chair, looks down, and is silent.

This input afforded the student-teachers the chance to discuss teaching from the perspective of the student and to generate several alternative ways the teacher could present a reading lesson so that students can be successful, including giving students more time to read, observing whether or not they have finished, having students discuss the questions in small groups before the teacher asks individual students.

Discussions of teaching can also build into a problem-solving process, an element of teacher preparation Celce-Murcia states student-teachers need to "cope with second language teaching in a variety of circumstances" (1983-98). And, student-teachers will indeed bring a variety of problems with them! When student-teachers introduce problems, they open themselves up to dialogue with other participants in the practicum. Such dialogue not only provides a chance for student-teachers to "talk through" a problem, thus facilitating possible clarification, but it also affords the chance to gain insight through the responses they get to questions they ask related to the problem. When these responses are in the form of alternative ways to work out the problem, the student-teachers have the means through which to change their teaching behavior.

This can be illustrated by studying the problems and related questions a student-teacher raised during a practicum in relation to the changes she made in the treatment of student errors. During two seminars she raised the questions "Shall I correct students now or not?" and "Isn't error correction really like

changing the subject?". She received several responses, all in the form of alternative ways to treat errors. It was suggested that she collect sentences with errors in them as the students worked in groups, write them on the blackboard, and later have the students correct them. Another suggestion was to stop the communication purposely at some point and do "mini lessons" on some of the errors. She was then able to generate her own suggestion, that of tape recording students' language, going home and listening to it, and designing a lesson based on common errors. This student-teacher was later observed working with students on their errors through these and other ways, something she did not do before the seminar discussion, indicating that the seminar (among other activities) can provide opportunities for student-teachers to consider change.

The openness through which student-teachers are willing to talk about their teaching and other experiences is likely facilitated by the way the teacher-educator interacts with the student-teachers, and we believe that student-teachers will more openly express themselves if they are not threatened by the experience. Thus, we agree with Stevick who states that new behaviors are more easily learned "if the learner is not busy defending himself from someone else" (1976:128).

An analysis of how talk about teaching was arranged in a seminar so that student-teachers felt secure to openly express themselves provides insight. In Scene 3.0 Mark, the teacher-educator, asked the student-teachers to share their feelings about their first two experiences of teaching.

Scene 3.0

3.1 June: I'm tired (..) Ahm, I've really enjoyed it. Very much fun.

3.2 Mark: Hum hum (..)

3.3 June: Of course, you know, anxiety about the, you know, not knowing
3.4 what to do and (..)

3.5 Mark: Yeah.

3.6 June: And stuff like that.

3.7 Mark: So despite the initial anxiety, still you were (.)

3.8 June: Yeah. I really had fun. It was very - It was fun (...)

3.9 Brent: Taking the two classes I've experienced, both extremes. At
3.10 the end of the first class I was totally overcome with a sense
3.11 of despair, you know. It was almost crushing, you know.
3.12 Helplessness. Uncertainty. Frustration. At the end of today's
3.13 class I was walking on air.

3.14 Mark: Um hum. Uhm hum.

3.15 Brent: I have a feeling that, you know, the sense of elation I walked
3.16 away with today is probably a little false, but it was satisfying.

3.17 Mark: Yeah. Yeah. Nice to know that it wasn't going to be all like
3.18 it wa the first day (..) Yeah (...)

3.19 Anne: Yes. I wasn't nervous or anything.

Mark did not judge the student-teachers' feelings aobut their experiences. He did not, for example, tell them that one kind of feeling is more valid than another. Rather, he paraphrased back to them what he understood them to be saying (3.7; 3.17-3.18), and showed that he was listening to them through his use of language such as "uhm hum" and "Yeah" (3.2; 3.5; 3.14). Furthermore, Mark did not interrupt them. Instead he used silence (3.2; 3.4; 3.8; 3.18 - each period inside parenthesis indicates one second of silence) as a way to provide time for them to process their ideas and feelings without the threat of having to constantly say something.

Finally, Mark matched the "kinesthetic" predicates the student-teachers used ("tired", line 3.1; "anxiety", line 3.3; "sense of despair", "crushing", "helplessness", "frustration", "walking on air", lines 3.10-3.13) through his use of similar predicates ("exhausting", line 3.2; "anxiety", line 3.7). Although we hesitate to use such abstract words as "rapport" and "empathy", it

is worth considering, as Bandler and Grinder (1979) have done after studying the interaction between successful therapists and their patients, that matching of language behaviors result in closer rapport. At least it appears that Mark was attempting to understand the student-teachers' model of the world and way of expressing the first couple of days of teaching.

Thus, in the view of Rardin and Oprandy (1985), if the teacher-educator takes on the responsibility of being a sensitive listener, and is truly understanding, the student-teachers, as reflected in the openness in which they were able to discuss their feelings in Scene 3.0, will risk spontaneous communication, giving strength to an unfolding atmosphere of trust and sense of security. In turn, such an open communicative context sets up the means through which student-teachers have opportunities to share and explore their teahcing.

There are many other possible behaviors that can be used between the teacher-educator and the student-teachers to explore and change their teaching behaviors. Dowling and Sheppard (1976) present a detailed individualized counseling model of supervision, while Early and Bolitho (1981) show how a counseling model can be done in groups. Fanselow (in press) discusses how supervisors and teachers can work together (or the teacher alone) in describing teaching behaviors, and based on description, generate alternative ways to teach a lesson. Abbott and Carter (1985) show how a model of clinical supervision can be used to possibly facilitate change. Others present several models, including Freeman (1982) who discusses directive, alternative, and nondirective models, and Gebhard (1984) who dismisses the prescriptive model and provides other choices, including collaborative, nondirective, alternative, and creative models.

(5) Reading about Teaching

One way reading can be brought into a practicum is to assign readings at the beginning of the course. Another way is for the teacher-educator to provide readings which could relate to a student's present interest. For example, if a student-teacher expresses interest in any one of many methodologies, the teacher-educator could have readings on hand in specialized methodologies (Silent Way, Natural Approach, Grammar Translation, Audio-Lingual Approach, Counseling-Learning/Community Language Learning, Suggestopedia, Total Physical Response, etc.) as presented in Blair (1982), Larsen-Freeman (1986), Richards and Rodgers (1986), Stevick (1980) among others. Such readings provide a way for student-teachers not only to consider their philosophy of teaching, but also provide insight into behaviors which can be used in the classroom.

Likewise, reading in which the authors purposely focus on teaching techniques and activities, such as Clark's (1980) presentation of specialized techniques, Maley and Duff's (1982) drama techniques, Bowen, Madsen, and Hiferty's (1985) techniques for teaching skills, Wright, Betteridge and Buckby's (1984) games, and Stevick's (1986) presentation of "images" and "options" in language teaching, offer much for student-teachers to consider in relation to what possible teaching behaviors can be implemented into their lessons.

If the teacher-educator wants to provide student-teachers with insight from research, as Griffin (1984) and Long (1983) encourage, readings can be in the form of CCR. Unlike readings in specialized methodologies, CCR informs student-teachers, as Long (1983) points out, about how teaching can be done without prescribing the best way to teach. For example, student-teachers whose investigative interests are on the nature of communicative classroom interaction around questioning strategies, group work, and other factors, might benefit from reading Brock (1986), Buckheister and Fanselow (1983), Long and Porter (1985),

Long and Sato (1983), and Pica and Long (1986). Rowe's (1986) article on "wait time" could provide additional insight into the use of silence in classrooms, and student-teachers interested in error treatment, as the student-teacher referred to earlier was, could be given any one of numerous articles. (See Bailey, 1985, and Gaies, 1983, for reviews on error treatment, and Day, 1986, for two new articles).

Finally, readings can be used to make the teacher-educator's or program's underlying beliefs about teaching clear. For example, we use Gallwey's (1976) ideas about teaching in his book Inner Tennis: Playing the Game to support our belief that judgments of self and teaching performance inhibit understanding, while nonjudgmental description of performance facilitates understanding.

(6) Keeping a Journal

Journals, either written or taped, afford student-teachers a vehicle for reacting to lessons and sharing feelings about what they are doing in the practicum, and as many student-teachers have stated, it provides them with an opportunity to express ideas they may otherwise hesitate to bring forth in a face-to-face discussion. The process of writing or taping a journal on a regular basis also, as one student-teacher expressed it, helps me "to raise questions that I did not know I had", and, as K. Bailey (1983) points out about diary entries by second language learners, the process of writing in journals can possibly play a part in the reduction of anxiety.

We have found that student-teachers write or talk about what Fanselow (in press) calls "golden" and "leaden" moments in teaching, and such expression, along with subsequent dialogue between the teacher-educator and student-teacher, can provide both parties with awareness of the latter's feelings toward teaching, the students, the teacher educator, the practicum, and much more.

An additional advantage of journal writing or taping is that it provides another forum through which a student-teacher and teacher-educator can dialogue without having to meet physically. "Understanding responses" and "questing" (rather than questioning) comments and queries (Curran, 1978), and references to resources can help establish, in written or taped modes, a further opening of the channels of communication between them.

Conclusion

The purpose of this article has been to share insights into how six activities can provide opportunities for student-teachers to explore and change their teaching behaviors. If these activities, including the suggestions for student-teacher involvement within them, are implemented as a whole and student-teachers are provided with opportunities, in a secure setting, to relate one experience to another as they participate in them, the possibility for successful exploration and change in teaching behavior will be facilitated.

We want to emphasize that although our ideas about a multi-activity approach to teacher preparation are based on systematic study of student-teachers' behavior and on-going analysis of the relationship between teacher change and interventions in their program of study, much more research is needed and encouraged to both validate our discoveries and to realize other relationships between teacher preparation interventions and teacher change.

REFERENCES

Abbott, Suzanne and Ralph M. Carter. 1985. Clinical Supervision and the foreign language teacher. Foreign Language Annals 18 (1): 25-29.

Alatis, James E., H. H. Stern and Peter Strevens. 1983. GURT '83: applied linguistics and the preparation of second language teachers, toward a rationale. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Allwright, Richard L. 1980. Turns, topics, and tasks: patterns of participation in language learning and teaching. In Discourse analysis in second language research, D. Larsen-Freeman (Ed.). Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.

Bailey, Kathleen M. 1983. Competitiveness and anxiety in adult second language learning: looking at and through diary studies. In Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition, Herbert W. Selinger and Michael H. Long (Eds.). 67-103. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.

Bailey, Kathleen M. 1985. Classroom-centered research on language teaching and language learning. In Beyond basics: issues and research in TESOL, Marianna Celce-Murcia (Ed.). 96-122. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.

Bailey, Leona G. 1975. An observation method in the foreign language classroom: a closer look at interaction analysis. Foreign Language Annals 8 (4): 335-344.

Bandler, Richard and John Grinder. 1979. Frogs into princes. Moab, Utah: Real People Press.

Blair, Robert W. 1982. Innovative approaches to language teaching. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.

Bowen, J. Donald, Harold Madsen, and Ann Hiferty. 1985. TESOL techniques and procedures. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.

Brock, Cynthia A. 1986. The effects of referential questions on ESL classroom discourse. TESOL Quarterly 20 (1): 47-60.

Buckheister, Pattrick and John F. Fanselow. 1983. Do you have the key: In On TESOL '83: the question of control, Jean Handscombe, Richard A. Drem and Barry P. Taylor (Eds.). 223-230. Washington, D.C.: TESOL.

Celce-Murcia, Marianna. 1983. Problem-solving: a bridge builder between theory and practice. In GURT '83: applied linguistics and the preparation of second language teachers: toward a rationale, James E. Alatis, H. H. Stern and Peter Strevens (Eds.). 97-105. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Curran, Charles A. 1978. Understanding: a necessary ingredient in human belonging. East Dubuque, Illinois: Counseling-Learning Publications.

Cyphert, Frederick R. 1977. An analysis of research in teacher education. In Bilingual, ESOL, and foreign language teacher preparation: models, practices, and issues, John F. Fanselow and Richard L. Light (Eds.). 161-168. Washington, D.C.: TESOL.

Day, Richard R. 1986. Talking to learn: conversation in second language acquisition. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.

Dowling, Gretchen and Ken Sheppard. 1976. Teacher training: a counseling focus. In One TESOL '76, John F. Fanselow and Ruth H. Crymes (Eds.). 55-66. Washington, D.C.: TESOL.

Dunkin, Michael J. and Bruce J. Biddle. 1974. The Study of Teaching. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America.

Early, Patrick and Rod Bolitho. 1981. Reasons to be cheerful for helping teachers to get problems into perspective - a group counseling approach to the inservice teacher training of foreign teachers of English. Recherches Echanges 6 (1): 13-33.

Fanselow, John F. 1977. Beyond Rashomon -conceptualizing and observing the teaching act. TESOL Quarterly 11 (1): 17-41.

Fanselow, John F. 1983. Over and over again. In GURT '83: applied linguistics and the preparation of second language teachers: toward a rationale, James E. Alatis, H. H. Stern and Peter Strevens (Eds.). 168-176. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Fanselow, John F. in press. Breaking rules: alternatives in language teaching. New York: Longman.

Fanselow, John F. and Richard L. Light. 1977. Bilingual, ESOL, and foreign language teacher preparation: models, practices, issues. Washington, D.C.: TESOL.

Flanders, Ned A. 1960. Interaction analysis in the classroom: a manual for observers. Michigan: University of Michigan Press.

Freeman, Donald. 1982. Observing teachers: three approaches to in-service training and development. TESOL Quarterly 16 (1): 21-29.

Gage, N. L. 1978. The scientific basis of the art of teaching. New York: Teachers College Press.

Gaies, Stephen J. 1977. The nature of linguistic input in formal second language learning: linguistic and communication strategies in ESL teachers' classroom language. In On TESOL '77 teaching and learning English as a second language: trends in research and practice, H. Douglas Brown, Carlos A. Yorio, and Ruth H. Crymes (EDs.). Washington, D.C.: TESOL.

Gaies, Stephen J. 1983. The investigation of language classroom processes. TESOL Quarterly 17 (2): 205-217.

Gallway, Timothy W. 1976. Inner tennis: playing the game. New York: Random House.

Garfinkel, Harold. 1967. Studies in ethnomethodology. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Gebhard, Jerry G. 1984. Models of supervision: choices. TESOL Quarterly 18 (3): 501-514.

Gebhard, Jerry G. 1985. Interactional arrangements in a teacher preparation practicum: providing and blocking opportunities for change. Doctoral Dissertation. Teachers College, Columbia University.

Griffin, Gary A. 1984. Why use research in preservice teacher education? A proposal. Journal of Teacher Education 35 (4): 36-42.

Haberman, Martin. 1985. Can common sense effectively guide the behavior of beginning teachers? Journal of Teacher Education 36 (6): 32-35.

Larsen-Freeman, Diane. 1986. Techniques and principles in language teaching. New York: Oxford.

Libdeh, Abdalla A. 1984. Developing and using observation guides to describe teaching performance in ESOL classrooms. Doctoral Dissertation. Teachers College, Columbia University.

Long, Michael H. 1980. Inside the "black box": methodological issues in classroom research on language learning. Language Learning 30 (1):

Long, Michael H. 1983. Training the second language teacher as classroom researcher. In GURT '83, applied linguistics and the preparation of second language teachers: toward a rationale. James E. Alatis, H. H. Stern and Peter Strevens (Eds.). 281-297. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Long, Michael H. and Charlene Sato. 1983. Classroom foreigner talk discourse: forms and functions of teachers' questions. In Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition, Herbert W. Seliger and Michael H. Long (Eds.). 268-286. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.

Maley, Alan and Alan Duff. 1982. Drama techniques in language teaching New York: Cambridge University Press.

McDermott, R. P. and david Roth. 1978. The social organization of behavior: interactional approaches. Annual Review of Anthropology 7: 321-345.

Mehan, Hugh. 1974. Accomplishing classroom lessons. In Language use and school performance, Aaron V. Cicourel et al. (Eds.). 76-142. New York: Academic Press.

Meredith, Nikki. 1984. The murder epidemic. Science 84, December: 43-48.

Moskowitz, Gertrude. 1971. Interaction analysis - a new modern language for supervisors. Foreign Language Annals 5 (2): 211-221.

Nearhoof, O. 1969. Teacher-pupil interaction in the foreign language classroom: a technique for self-evaluation. In Teaching foreign languages, F. M. Grittner (Ed.). 328-340. New York: Harper and Row.

Pica, Teresa and Michael H. Long. 1986. The linguistic and conversational performance of experienced and inexperienced teachers. In Talking to learn: conversation in second language acquisition, Richard R. Day (Ed.). 85-98. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.

Rardin, Jennybelle and Robert Oprandy. 1985. Listening skills through an understanding relationship. TESOL Newsletter 19 (6): 19-21.

Rees, Alun L. W. 1980. The teacher observed - but how? English Language Teaching Journal 35 (1): 16-22.

Richards, Jack C. and Theodore S. Rodgers. 1986. Approaches and methods in language teaching. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Roskenshine, B. and N. Furst. 1973. The use of direct observation to study teaching. In Second handbook of research on teaching, R. M. Travers (ED),1 122-183. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company.

Rowe, Mary Budd. 1969. Science, silence and sanctions. Science and Children 6 (6): 11-13.

Rowe, Mary Budd. 1986. Wait time: slowing down may be a way of speeding up. Journal of Teacher Education 37 (1): 43-50.

Saliger, Herbert W. and Michael H. Long. 1983. Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Simon, Anita and E. Gil Boyer. 1974. Mirrors for behavior III: an anthology of observation instruments. Wyncote, PA: Communication Materials Center.

Stern, H. H. 1983. Language teacher education: an approach to the issues and a framework for discussion. In GURT '83; applied linguistics and the preparation of second language teachers: toward a rationale, James E. Alatis, H. H. Stern, and Peter Strevens (EDS.). 342-361. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Stevick, Earl W. 1980. A way and ways. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.

Stevick, Earl W. 1976. Memory, meaning, and method. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Stevick, Earl W. 1986. Images and options in the language classroom. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wragg, E. C. 1970. Interaction analysis in the foreign language classroom. Modern Language Journal 54: 116-120.

Wright, Andrew, David Betteridge, and Michael Bucleby. 1984. Games for language learning. New York: Cambridge University Press.